

REMARKS

The Applicants request reconsideration of the rejection.

Claims 18-34 are now pending.

Submitted herewith is a certified copy of the corresponding Japanese patent application (JP 11-066019, filed March 12, 1999). An indication that this document has been safely received would be appreciated.

Claims 1-9 and 14-17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Hoese et al U.S. Patent No. 5,941,972 (Hoese). Claims 10-11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hoese in view of Wolff U.S. Patent No. 6,185,601 (Wolff). Claims 12-13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hoese in view of Wolff.

Each of these rejections has been rendered moot by the cancellation of the rejected claims. Claims 18-34 patentably define over Hoese and Wolff, however, for the reasons which follow.

As newly defined, the invention is directed to a computer system in which plural computers share a storage system including a plurality of logical units, wherein the logical units include one logical unit which contains an operating

system (OS) shared by more than one of said computers. The logical unit containing the OS is detected by a computer during boot-up.

Hoeze discloses a storage router that couples a plurality of workstations to storage devices, and maps between the workstations and storage devices. Hoeze's storage router further implements access control for space on the storage devices.

Wolff discloses a method for dynamic load balancing in which a plurality of client computers are coupled to a file or print server, and the file or print server is coupled to a storage volume. A client computer accesses a storage volume via the file or print server by issuing an access request to the file or print server.

Neither Hoeze nor Wolff discloses or fairly suggests that a plurality of computers in a computer system are each arranged to detect a logical unit contained in a shared storage device, in which an OS is stored for sharing by the plural computers. Further, neither Hoeze nor Wolff discloses that each of the computers boots up the operating system in the detected logical unit.

The Applicants have noted that the Examiner finds the use of shared and non-shared units in memory by multiple nodes to

be well known in the art, citing Wolff's Figure 5D. While it is true that the Applicants do not claim to be the first to disclose access to multiple-shared storage as disclosed by Wolff, the Applicants respectfully submit that the Wolff shared storage access does not contemplate the boot-up of an operating system stored in a shared logical unit, which must be detected by the computer seeking the operating system. In other words, the combination of Hoesse and Wolff does not describe the arrangement of a computer system which can incorporate the "thin client" technology in which the operating system is stored not at the individual computer, but in a logical unit shared by plural computers. To this end, the Applicants note that the claimed invention is not limited to a server-client system in view of the employment of the claimed storage system and management control therefor. Accordingly, claims 18-34 are believed to patentably define over the combination of Hoesse and Wolff.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the Applicants request reconsideration of the rejection and allowance of the claims.

Respectfully submitted,

  
Daniel J. Stanger  
Registration No. 32,846  
Attorney for Applicants

MATTINGLY, STANGER & MALUR, P.C.  
1800 Diagonal Road, Suite 370  
Alexandria, Virginia 22314  
Telephone: (703) 684-1120  
Facsimile: (703) 684-1157  
Date: December 29, 2003

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to:  
Commissioner For Patents and Trademarks,  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

on 12/29/03, by M.J. C